



ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

2004 MAR -4 P 2: 18

MARC SPITZER, Chairman  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
MIKE GLEASON  
KRISTIN K. MAYES

MAR - 4 2004

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

GA

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO. S-03464A-03-0000

MUTUAL BENEFITS CORPORATION,

Respondents.

SEVENTH  
PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On April 30, 2003, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against Mutual Benefits Corporation ("MBC" or "Respondent"), in which the Division alleged multiple violations of the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of life and viatical settlements ("viaticals") and/or investment contracts.

The Respondent was duly served with a copy of the Notice.

On May 13, 2003, a request for hearing was filed for MBC.

On May 15, 2003, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled.

On May 28, 2003, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for More Definite Statement ("Motion to Dismiss or More Definite Statement").

On June 4, 2003, Respondent filed a Motion to Quash Subpoena ("Motion to Quash") of third party, Ms. Debbie Bugliera. The subpoena issued to Ms. Bugliera was issued on May 6, 2003 after the Notice herein was issued. The subpoena references this proceeding on its face and a copy was not served on the Respondent. Subsequently, Ms. Bugliera did not appear in response to the Division's subpoena to give testimony under oath and Respondent filed the Motion to Quash herein.

On June 5, 2003, the Division and the Respondent appeared by counsel to address issues raised in the proceeding. The parties agreed that a second pre-hearing conference should be scheduled in early August, 2003 after some initial discovery had taken place in order that a hearing could be scheduled once the approximate number of witnesses was determined and whether certain

1 matters could be resolved by stipulation. By Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was  
2 scheduled on August 5, 2003.

3 On June 9, 2003, the Division filed its Response to the Motion to Dismiss or More Definite  
4 Statement.

5 On June 17, 2003, the Division filed its Response in opposition to the Respondent's Motion to  
6 Quash. While presenting a number of legal arguments against the Motion to Quash, the Division  
7 acknowledged that "Pre-hearing discovery in agency proceedings is a matter of agency discretion."

8 On June 20, 2003, Respondent filed its Reply to the Division's Response to the Motion to  
9 Dismiss or More Definite Statement.

10 On June 24, 2003, the Respondent filed its Reply to the Division's Response essentially  
11 restating its earlier arguments that the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure ("ARCP") should apply as  
12 stated by Commission rule, A.A.C. R14-3-109(P).

13 On June 27, 2003, by Procedural Order, the Motion to Quash was not granted, but  
14 Respondent's counsel was granted an opportunity to participate as set forth in the ARCP if the  
15 subpoena is reinstated.

16 On July 3, 2003, by Procedural Order, the Commission denied Respondent's Motion for More  
17 Definite Statement and took under advisement MBC's Motion to Dismiss.

18 On August 5, 2003, a pre-hearing conference was held with the Respondent and the Division  
19 appearing through counsel. The parties agreed that more time for discovery was needed and further  
20 agreed to a status conference on September 23, 2003, which was subsequently ordered by Procedural  
21 Order.

22 On September 23, 2003, at the status conference, the scheduling of the proceeding was  
23 discussed and the respective counsel agreed that the proceeding should be scheduled during April  
24 2004, and estimated the time required for hearing will be between three and four weeks.

25 On October 29, 2003, by Procedural Order, a hearing on the Notice was scheduled to  
26 commence on April 7, 2004.

27 On February 19, 2004, the Division and MBC filed a Joint Request to Continue the  
28 proceeding until November 15, 2004. Subsequently, during a teleconference, the parties agreed that

1 the proceeding commence on October 25, 2004.

2 Accordingly, the hearing should be continued.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the hearing shall be continued from April 7, 2004, to  
4 October 25, 2004 at 10:00 a.m., at the Commission's offices, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix,  
5 Arizona.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall also set aside October 26, 27, 28,  
7 November 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 16, 17 and 18, 2004 for additional days of hearing, if necessary.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for the respective parties shall exchange copies of  
9 their exhibits, witness lists and summaries of each witnesses' testimony and provide a courtesy copy  
10 of same to the presiding Administrative Law Judge by October 1, 2004.

11 DATED this 4TH day of March, 2004.


12  
13   
14 MARC E. STERN  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

15 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered  
this 4 day of March, 2004 to:

16 Paul J. Roshka, Jr.  
17 Alan S. Baskin  
18 James M. McGuire  
19 One Arizona Center  
20 400 East Van Buren Street, Ste. 800  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Attorneys for Respondent

21 Matt Neubert, Acting Director  
22 Securities Division  
23 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1300 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

24 Arizona Reporting Service, Inc.  
25 2627 N. Third Street, Suite Three  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1103

26 By:   
27 Molly Johnson  
28 Secretary to Marc E. Stern